

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Enclosed please find replacement sheets for all of the Figures. These replacement sheets do not add new matter. These replacement sheets were intended to be filed with the preliminary amendment. The amendments made to these drawings are only made to clarify the disclosure and invention set forth in the above-captioned patent application. Formal drawings will be prepared and filed upon receipt of a Notice of Allowance.

## REMARKS

Claims 1 through 13 were previously cancelled. Claims 14 through 20, 23 and 24 remain in the application. Claim 21 stands rejected. Claims 14 through 20, 22 and 23 are objected to. Claim 14 is in independent form. Claims 21 and 22 have been cancelled.

The Examiner has stated that a separate sheet of information relevant to the invention of the above-captioned patent application has not been submitted. An information disclosure statement is being submitted herewith, rendering the objection moot.

The Examiner has objected to the oath or declaration stating that the declaration is defective because the inventors have not signed the declaration in the correct place. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. More specifically, the declaration that was filed was signed by both of the inventors in the signature blocks where indicated. The signatures happen to be on the same line as the inventor's name as opposed to below the inventor's name. This does not, however, result in a defective declaration. Each inventor has signed the declaration claiming that they understand the invention as disclosed in the above-captioned patent application to be their invention and they signed the declaration knowing that the other inventor was to sign the declaration as well. Both inventors have signed the declaration in a signature block prepared specifically for that particular inventor. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the declaration is not defective, the inventors have signed the declaration, and that the declaration is effective for the continued prosecution of the patent application.

The drawings have been objected to. In one instance, the Examiner has objected to the drawings because the orientation of the light guide 8' as shown in Figures 2 through 4 is improper. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. While the Figures are schematic in nature and not intended to show direction, Applicant has amended Figures 2 through 4 to include an orientation in the light guides 8, 8'. While one skilled in the art could clearly identify that the light guides 8, 8' would have different paths than those shown in the Figures, Applicant is amending drawings to overcome this rejection. These amendments add no new matter as the changes merely reflect the written description.

In addition, the Examiner has objected to the drawings because reference characters 2a, 2b and 30 are not in the drawings. Applicant has amended the drawings to include these reference characters. Like the amendments above, Applicant has added no new matter to the patent application and these amendments are made merely for clarification of the invention.

The drawings are also objected to because the Examiner states that every feature of the invention as specified in the claims must be shown. Applicant traverses this rejection. In a first instance, the Examiner has stated that the phrase "a light guide disposed between said housing and said sensor" is not shown in the drawings. Applicant has amended the drawings to clearly identify that the light guide is disposed between the housing and the sensor. In a second instance, the Examiner has stated that the drawings do not shown a feature set forth in claim 16 which, in particular, relates to the first light guide channel including a first light entrance disposed adjacent and parallel to the electrochromatic mirror glass. Applicant refers the Examiner to Figure 1 and has amended Figure 2 to show that the first light entrance surface is parallel and disposed adjacent to the electrochromatic mirror glass.

In a third instance, the Examiner has objected to the drawings because the second light entrance surface of the second light guide and the electromatic mirror glass as recited in the features of claim 17 are not shown. Again, Applicant has amended the drawings, and in particular, Figures 2 through 4 to show the features set forth in claim 17. Therefore, Applicant respectfully traverses this objection.

Finally, the Examiner has objected to the drawings with regard to the features as set forth in claim 21. Applicant has cancelled claim 21, rendering the rejection to the drawings for this particular feature moot.

The Examiner has made specific objections to the specification. Applicant has corrected these informalities. Therefore the objections to the specification are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has also objected to informalities with regard to claims 14 through 24. Applicant has amended the claims and hereby submits that the claims overcome these objections.

The Examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant has cancelled claim 21, rendering the rejection thereto moot.

The Examiner has rejected claim 22 based on double patenting of the “same invention” under 35 USC §101. Applicant has cancelled claim 22 rendering the rejection thereto moot.

It is respectfully submitted that this patent application is in condition for allowance, which allowance is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment or patent application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/david j simonelli/

---

David J. Simonelli, Esq.  
(Reg. No. 36,680)  
Reising Ethington Barnes Kisselle, P.C.  
P.O. Box 4390  
Troy, MI 48099-4390  
(248) 689-3500

**Date:** August 20, 2007  
**Attorney Docket No.** 7739.3025.001